MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0182725		
Date Assigned:	09/23/2015	Date of Injury:	05/17/2012
Decision Date:	11/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/17/2015

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
State(s) of Licensure: California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 34 year old male sustained an industrial injury on 5-17-12. The injured worker is being treated for depression. Treatments to date include MRI testing and prescription medications. The injured worker has continued complaints of left lower extremity pain and mobility. The pain has affected the injured worker's activity level and ability to perform household chores. The injured worker has remained off work. Upon examination, there was tenderness about the left knee noted. A request for Topamax 60mg #60, Protonix 20mg #60, Ultracet 37.5mg #60, Flexeril 7.5mg #60 and Celebrex 200mg #30 was made by the treating physician.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

Topamax 60mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

Decision rationale: Regarding request for topiramate (Topamax), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that antiepilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. They go on to state that a good outcome is defined as 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response is defined as 30% reduction in pain. Guidelines go on to state that after initiation of treatment, there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any specific analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduction of NRS), and no documentation of specific objective functional improvement. Additionally, there is no discussion regarding side effects from this medication. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested topiramate (Topamax) is not medically necessary.

Protonix 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter, PPI.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for pantoprazole (Protonix), California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Additionally, ODG recommends Nexium, Protonix, Dexilant, and AcipHex for use as 2nd line agents, after failure of omeprazole or lansoprazole. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has history of gerd relating to NSAID use. However, there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line agents prior to initiating treatment with pantoprazole (a 2nd line proton pump inhibitor). In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested pantoprazole is not medically necessary.

Ultracet 37.5mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain (Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids for chronic pain, Opioids, specific drug list.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Ultracet (tramadol/acetaminophen), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Ultracet is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and

pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain, in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS. Furthermore, there is history of inconsistent urine drug screens, and discussion regarding aberrant use has not taken place. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Ultracet (tramadol/ acetaminophen) is not medically necessary.

Flexeril 7.5mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for cyclobenzaprine, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that cyclobenzaprine specifically is recommended for a short course of therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the cyclobenzaprine. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. Given this, the current request is not medically necessary.

Celebrex 200mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Celebrex, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Celebrex is recommended for patients at intermediate to high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease. Page 22 of the CPMTG states "COX-2 inhibitors (e.g., Celebrex) may be considered if the patient has a risk of GI complications, but not for the majority of patients." Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that Celebrex is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction, or reduction in numeric rating scale), or any objective functional improvement. There is no documentation of failure of non-selective NSAIDs. Given this, the currently requested Celebrex is not medically necessary.